



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

THE IDEA OF A UNIVERSITY

LADIES AND GENTLEMEN :—In arranging the programme of the convention, the executive committee desired that an opportunity should be given to express whatever consensus of opinion might have been reached, as the result of the discussion of the last few years, in regard to those fundamental questions of college and of secondary education which have come up so often for our consideration. They did not, of course, imagine, that in place of the agnosticism and the groping in educational matters which is now so prevalent, there would result from this discussion—from the labors of this convention—a creed of ecumenical validity, which we should adopt and go home and practice. They did, however, feel, that, as during the last eight or ten years we have constantly been discussing points on which we have differed, there might, if we would but collate our views and throw the conflict of ideas into one common ferment, result what I may call a practical working theory of secondary education. How far the judgment of your committee may be at fault in this matter, or how far it will be borne out by the facts, it lies, of course, in your equity to judge. I had myself urged upon the committee that instead of the annual presidential address, we should this year, as the session was a somewhat short one, substitute a regular evening meeting, which should also be given up to the consideration of these important themes. But they were inexorable and insisted that the usual address should be given; and, as for subject, they, kindly suggested that the whole universe lay open to me, provided only I did not discuss themes which had been assigned to other speakers. Proceeding by this process of exclusion, I found myself at last attracted to a subject to which I was somewhat naturally conducted by the nature of my interests, by my tastes, by my training,—a subject, also, which, of recent years, and even of recent months, among our-

selves, has given rise to a good deal of discussion in the newspapers, and the periodicals, and the higher organs of literary expression.

The subject which I have chosen is "The Idea of a University." I am quite aware that it is a large theme; and that, if there be any consensus of opinion on the other topics which we have here been discussing, it is likely enough that even after I have finished you will not all be exactly in accord with me. Nevertheless, I thought it worth while to lay before you the views which I had come to entertain upon the subject; and my object has been to determine—I do not pretend to have reached any great result in the matter—but my aim, at any rate, was to endeavor to determine what the constitutive ideas of a university might be, and what had been the nature of their historical development. In other words, to look at the university from the point of view of its germinal idea, and of its historical evolution, is, at any rate, the problem I have set before me. And I flatter myself that the subject will not be out of keeping with that more general theme to which the committee has invited your attention; for if we can but determine approximately the true idea of the university, the discovery cannot fail to throw light upon those perennial problems of the relation of the college to the university, and of both to the secondary schools.

Now, ladies and gentlemen, when I addressed myself to this subject, the first thing which impressed me was the recency of the institution with which we are dealing. We habitually associate the university with that knowledge and culture of which it is the most potent instrument and agency. It is a natural association of ideas, and most inevitable; but from the point of view of history and chronology it is altogether perversive of the facts. Knowledge and culture, and the higher civilization existed long before the foundations of the oldest universities. As a wise man once said: "There is nothing new under the sun," it may also be said that the university is no new thing in the world; but in so far as we talk of anything new—the American Revolution, the Roman Empire, the papacy,—in the same sense we may

speak of the university as a new phenomenon, and, as I said a moment ago, a recent, a modern one. The oldest university is not much more than eight hundred years old, but science and medicine, and theology and law, and all the higher things in civilization take us back beyond the dawn of Christianity to the Greeks and Romans, and to those mysterious peoples of the Orient,—behind whom, even in that remote period, there loomed a still venerable antiquity. This thought is worth, as it seems to me, dwelling upon for a little ; because in the first place it may give us some adequate conception (which, through the machinery of education, we are constantly apt to overlook) of the creative power of unschooled mind. If anything can set us right in this matter, if anything can show us the altogether secondary position which educational institutions occupy in the history of human culture, it is surely this thought, that the great intellectual and æsthetic achievements of Greece, for example, all that Athens achieved in art, literature, and philosophy, preceded by some fifty generations the emergence of the earliest university ; and this brilliant age, the age of Phidias, the age of Sophocles, the age of Pericles,—the great achievements, I say, of this brilliant age were the products of men who knew no foreign languages, whose acquaintance with science and mathematics and history was below that of Macaulay's proverbial schoolboy, and whose knowledge in other things was, I suppose, confined to the elements of logic, rhetoric, and oratory. The university is the potent instrument—certainly in our days—of the higher civilization, and especially of that culture which constitutes its most intellectual element ; but the university is vastly later than these.

The second thing which has impressed me while thinking upon this subject is that we constantly misunderstand (at any rate, if we apply the historical criterion of judgment) the nature of the university. John Henry Newman, in his work on "*The Idea of a University*" (the only work, so far as I know, in the English language, which deals with the subject that I have chosen as the subject of my address) lays down, in the very

preface, a thesis which chimes in with our own natural way of thinking; but which, I am sure, is altogether erroneous. That subtle master of dialectics says: "A university, by its very name, professes to teach universal knowledge." It was in the fifties—1852, I think—when Newman wrote the dedication to his "Idea of a University;" and there have been many changes in the half century which has elapsed: an enlargement of knowledge, an interest in new intellectual fields, a changed attitude towards authority, a metamorphosis of the *Zeitgeist*; so that much which Newman wrote, and wrote so well, has become obsolete through the mere lapse of time. I suspect this is also true of the fundamental theses of his "Idea of a University." Certainly, when he claims that the university, by the very nature of its essence, aims at teaching universal knowledge, he flies in the face of history. I am far from saying that in our day it may not be a captivating ideal, and perhaps a necessity of our civilization, and I certainly am not likely to forget that the founder of at least one modern university aimed to make it (the ideal always far outruns the fact), but he *aimed* to make it, "an institution where any person can find instruction in any study." That may be, for us, I say, a quite intelligent and natural and necessary aim, but historically considered it is absolutely without foundation, if you erect it into the notion of the constitutive essence of a university. Universities did not aim, in the first place, at teaching universal knowledge, and in the second place, if I may dwell for a moment on the mere word (and Newman's argument is an etymological one), the word "university" does not mean a university of faculties, it does not mean an institution which is the nursery of every kind of learning and scholarship. The word "*universitas*" implies etymologically simply a number of persons, a party, or, in its more formal sense, a corporation of any kind whatsoever, and in the twelfth and thirteenth centuries, when universities were being founded, the term "*universitas*" was not one primarily applied to them at all in the sense in which we apply "university," but another, which I shall deal with a little later on. When the word "univer-

sitas" was used, it signified simply an aggregate of persons: the guild of scholars, for instance, at Bologna, the guild of masters at Paris, or at Oxford. I use the term "guild" of set purpose, in order to bring out clearly the relation between the scholastic craft and the other trades-unions of the time. Whenever men came together in the twelfth and thirteenth centuries they formed such guilds, so there were guilds of tailors, and of carpenters and other mechanics, and there were city guilds or municipalities, and to each and all of these, the word "universitas" was applied in exactly the same sense in which it was applied to the guilds of scholars, or to the guilds of masters. Newman's etymological argument is therefore utterly fallacious. Furthermore if we consult history we shall find that as a matter of fact, these earlier universities did not aim at representing, in their faculties, every branch of learning. There never was, for instance, a faculty of medicine or law at Oxford University. Bologna University became famous for its school of law. Salerno was nothing but a school of medicine, and at least two universities—Saragossa and Erfurt—were simply schools of arts, or what you would perhaps call colleges alone. Neither etymologically nor historically, therefore, is there any warrant for the statement that, as Newman declares, "the university aims at teaching universal knowledge."

What we call a university—*universitas*—did not, in the twelfth and thirteenth and fourteenth centuries receive that designation at all. What we call the university was then called a "*studium generale*"—place of general study, you would perhaps translate it. No, the "general" lay not in the multiplicity and variety and comprehensiveness of subjects taught, the "general" lay in the number of patronizing localities. It was not an institution where all branches of learning were taught, but it was an institution to which students came from all parts, and in the twelfth century, the close of the twelfth century and the beginning of the thirteenth century—there were a very small number—three—of such "*studia generalia*."

Let me now glance very briefly at these institutions, and

then I shall go on afterwards to speak of what seem to me their essential characteristics. I will say, first of all, that when the eleventh century closed there was but one university in the world, that was the University of Salerno, and when the thirteenth closed there were not more than six: Salerno and Bologna and Paris and Oxford and Reggio and Montpellier, these and no others. I ask you to think, for a little while, on what is involved in the making of a university, and why it was so new a thing in the world, when Salerno and Bologna and Paris came into existence. Clearly, we may have knowledge and culture without universities, as I have already indicated by great historic examples, but you may also have teaching without universities. It is not necessary that the different teachers should come together and form a school; it is not necessary that such combinations or corporations of teachers should receive privileges and franchises; it is not necessary that requirements for matriculation should be laid down, courses of study and requirements for graduation prescribed. These were the peculiar features of the formal "study" of the studium generale; these are the peculiar features of our universities, and all these, ladies and gentlemen, originated with the institutions I have just mentioned.

The middle ages, the historians tell us, were characterized by their genius for embodying ideals in institutions. That is the work which the middle ages have done for our civilization, and the three great institutions, historians tell us, which they built up were the university, the church, and the empire. A writer of the fifteenth century classes these three institutions together as the three sustaining powers and virtues of Christendom. It was felt in the middle ages that in the university a new and a potent institution had arisen.

Now let me go back to the specimens which I have mentioned. I am not going to consider all six which I have mentioned; Salerno, which arose about the middle of the eleventh century; Bologna, which arose towards the close of the twelfth; and Paris and Oxford and Reggio and Montpellier, which fol-

lowed soon after. Reggio, for instance, was a mere offshoot from Bologna, although it was called a "*studium generale*." That was due to the accident that the towns around about were autonomous—were separate states; and therefore, although topographically considered they were close together, yet the students from them would of course hail from different states, and so gave the institution the name of "*studium generale*," or a place of general resort. That was a mere accident. Besides Reggio is not worth considering for another reason. In the thirteenth century it disappeared altogether. Nor shall I say much about Oxford, because it is an offshoot from Paris. Oxford owes its origin to the migration from Paris, which took place towards the close of the twelfth century—a migration probably due to the summons of Henry II, after his quarrel with Becket, to the benefice clergy who were studying in Paris, to return home as they loved their benefices. And, all loving their benefices, they did come home and set up a "*studium generale*" at Oxford. We shall, therefore, not speak of Oxford in any detail, because it is a university of the Parisian type. And although the "*studium generale*" at Montpellier was probably an independent institution, although it was not an offshoot of either of the others, yet it was dominated very largely by Bologna ideals. Accordingly we are left with but three primitive institutions, Salerno and Bologna and Paris. Of these, as I have stated, Salerno is the oldest. It was never more than a school of medicine. Why it should have started up in Italy early in the eleventh century (for it certainly was famous in the middle of the eleventh century) we cannot perhaps altogether understand. But some circumstances will at least help to make it clear why culture should have sprung up somewhere in old Magna Grecia. Classical tradition still lingered there with the classical literatures and the medical writers of the ancient world were known. And Salerno being a health resort, it was very natural that if any sort of school were to spring up in the region, it should be a medical school. At any rate, Salerno began and continued as a medical school; it never had any other faculty; and what is

perhaps still more strange, it never, so far as we know, gave rise to any other institution. That, I say, is a striking fact; because there is nothing more remarkable about Bologna and Paris than their reproductive capacity. They gave rise to numerous other institutions; but Salerno was doomed to infertility. It ended as it was at the beginning, as a school of medicine; and what is more, the other great medical schools of Europe were uninfluenced by its traditions. No virtue of any kind went out from it; and so it happened that the traditions of this earliest school of medicine died with itself—they were not reproduced elsewhere.

Turn now to the other two institutions I have mentioned—Bologna and Paris. These, ladies and gentlemen, are the two great typical universities of the world: one of them, Bologna, a guild of scholars; the other, Paris, a guild of masters. I would like for a little time to dwell on that word “guild” and explain why such guilds of necessity arose, and also the difference between the two. I have already alluded to the object of associations in the middle ages. The cities of northern Italy were free republics. The traditions of Roman law lingered in northern Italy much longer than anywhere else; and in the free life of these northern Italian cities, it is easy to understand that developments of law should take place, and, in time, the need of some institution to extend the knowledge of it. At any rate, somewhere in the twelfth century such a school of law was formed at Bologna; but the strange thing about the school thus formed is that the corporation, the guild, the “universitas,” was not a corporation of professors and teachers, but of scholars only. And why? Because the scholars who flocked to that “studium generale” from all parts of northern Italy, sacrificed their own citizenship. The inhabitants of the cities of northern Italy valued citizenship as the citizens of ancient Greece or Rome did; and so it was natural when they came together in a foreign city, losing the franchises of their own home, that they should form themselves into a quasi-republic, a new city, a new organization; and this, I say, would have been an easy thing for them to do, considering that they had before them, among the mechan-

ics and in the municipalities, a perfect model which they could easily imitate. Consequently, the University of Bologna became a corporation of students. But there was one other limitation; Bologna students were excluded. This is easily understood, for Bologna students, not having left their own homes, enjoyed those privileges and franchises which the visiting students had forfeited in coming to Bologna. The interesting thing about this earliest university, this guild of students, is that it took—as we say in common parlance—the law into its own hands, dominated the professors, and at last subjected them to the most humiliating servitude. The guild of students made statutes, which of course their own members were obliged to obey; and these statutes, in the course of an incredibly short time, they managed to impose upon the professors, who were compelled to take the oath to obey them. And the professor, in the discharge of his duties, might at any time be interrupted by an officer coming from this haughty corporation of students, dictating to him, by public proclamation, how he should do his work. They made the minutest regulations regarding the lectures; the professor was to begin promptly at the moment and end also promptly at the moment (laughter)—he was not to take holidays except by permission of the students; and as it happened in those days, as some of us know by painful experience it happens in Germany and perhaps elsewhere still, that a professor will exhaust the larger part of the time allotted to him in dealing with the bibliography or introduction to his subject—this wise corporation of students stipulated, and made it one of their statutes, that the professor should cover, during the term, the whole of the book, or of the subject, assigned him. Never were professors so domineered over as they were by this bullying corporation of Bologna students. The rector was the officer who represented their authority. They chose him. It shows in a very striking way how the features and traditions of these earliest corporations survived to our own time, that only this month the students of the University of Glasgow filled also, in the ancient way, that venerable office of rector. The students of

the Scottish universities enjoy a franchise given no one elsewhere throughout the English-speaking world: they have the right annually—at Bologna it was, I think, biennially—but in the Scotch universities they have the right annually to elect some distinguished man as their rector. Of course, in the days of Bologna, that rector was the depositary of their authority and the exponent of their will—the personality who embodied in himself the “universitas” or guild; but in Scotland, this dignity has now become a mere supernumerary; and when, as I said, the other day the Right Honorable Joseph Chamberlain, secretary for the Colonies, was elected rector of the Glasgow University, he was chosen by the students, but instead of having charge of the entire institution, as his predecessor at Bologna had several centuries before, his sole function consisted in making one speech to the student body.

The University of Paris is the other type. It was not a guild of scholars—it was a guild of masters; they formed the corporation; they made the statutes; they laid down the laws regarding the educational work of the institution, the method of teaching and all the rest of it; and that is the type of university which, through its connection with Oxford, we in the English-speaking world have become so familiar with. I do not want to dwell longer on either of these institutions; but I do desire to call your attention to what I consider the essential, the peculiar function of this Parisian guild. It was a guild of doctors. Now, every guild had the right to regulate the conditions of membership. What more natural than that these masters should also lay down the conditions under which others should join the guild? The process of joining the guild, or, rather, the act of joining and being initiated, was called inception or commencement; and that is the origin of the word by which we describe the close of the scholastic year. The student who had satisfied the requirements laid down by the guild of doctors was incepted—commenced—as a teacher; and the inception process, or act, consisted of giving, as he would be required to do when he became a master, a lesson to the stu-

dents, after which he was invested with the ring and the book and also with the cap, and I may add that here too we have an interesting survival of that process. We now charge our students a fee for their diplomas; I do not think there is any university or college which grants them without it. That fee, ladies and gentlemen, is commutation money; and what it relieved the graduates of earlier centuries from was the necessity of entertaining the members of the guild into which they were being admitted at an expensive banquet, and of presenting these learned dignitaries with caps and canes and gloves and sweetmeats. Thus, in those days the idea of a newcomer paying his footing prevailed alike among the professorial bodies and among the students. Such, then, was the original meaning of our term "graduation." And when I say that the essential features, the time-honored usages and traditions of our modern universities, all go back to the two typical institutions of Paris and Bologna, you will see from the examples I have adduced (if there were time I could mention others) that considerable justification can be adduced for the assertion.

Without lingering longer over the historical side of the case, let me invite your attention, in the next place, to what seems to me the characteristic features of these institutions. The first is, no doubt, that indicated by the name "*studium generale*," a university is a place of general resort. It is a place to which students come, not only from the neighboring locality, but from a variety of localities. That was the fundamental idea of the "*studium generale*," or primitive university. But that was not all, even then; for, although it was the dominating idea, it was always implied that there should be at such an institution, first, a plurality of masters and, secondly, that at least one of the professional faculties should be included. I have mentioned already that there are exceptions even to that rule: Erfurt and Saragossa were simply faculties of arts; but the exception does not, after all, detract greatly from the validity of the general statement I have made, that, along with being a place of general resort, the "*studium generale*," or university of the middle ages,

was an institution where there were a number of masters, and where at least one of the professional faculties was to be found.

But there is another point to which now, in the second place, I wish to call your attention, and it is this: that the universities of the middle ages laid stress—as it was inevitable they should lay stress—on personality. They had no books; they had no buildings; they attended lectures either in the teacher's house or in rented rooms; and that very fact—the absence of all sorts of material and mechanical appliances—tended constantly to bring teacher and pupil face to face. The fact that the first universities had no material equipment, neither houses nor property, always made it easy for them to migrate; and migrations, or boycotts, were a remedy to which they had frequent recourse; and it was in that way that the corporation of students in Bologna could domineer over the masters. It was a profitable thing to have a “studium generale” in a city; but if the professors and the city authorities refused to do what the students wanted, all that was necessary was to boycott them and go elsewhere. Even Oxford University suffered boycotting in the same way, and until very recent times graduates were required to swear that they would not found a “studium generale” at Stamford, to which there had been a migration centuries ago.

But to return to the point from which I have digressed. It is interesting to see how great personalities, not only maintained these universities in their vigor, but lay, in a certain sense, at the foundation, if not of all of them, at any rate of the two typical institutions we know most about—of Bologna and of Paris. Ladies and gentlemen, the University of Paris came into existence at the close of the twelfth century. Abelard had come up to Paris as a student to study under William of Champeaux, who taught in the cathedral school, and he soon found himself, as he deemed, superior to his master and called in question his teachings, which of course was a mortal offense at that time, and he was persecuted for it. I have not time to go into the history now, but it was by the work which he did in dialectics, or metaphysics, and in theology that the atmosphere of France,

of northern Europe, was prepared in the course of one or two generations for the foundation of a "studium generale;" and it is because Abelard lived and worked and taught that the University of Paris became conspicuous for its theology, and not, for instance, as Bologna did, for law. Again, at Bologna—which, as I have mentioned, was founded about the same time as Paris, a little earlier, somewhere about the last third of the twelfth century—in the middle half of the twelfth century there lived a great lawyer named Irnerius; and Irnerius introduced the study of the Roman law—not, indeed, of parts of the Roman law, for that was already in effect in Bologna and possibly in other institutions in northern Italy—but he it was who first introduced the systematic study of the whole *corpus juris civile*; he it was who laid stress on the professional study of law, on the scientific study of law; and because he lived and did the work he did, it was possible, a generation later, for the University of Bologna to blossom forth; and whatever other characteristics belonging to the mediæval universities we may in modern times abandon, let me assert—and assert here, I know, without fear of contradiction—that we never can have a university without having men to make it (applause).

The third characteristic to which I should like to invite your consideration is this: the universities of Paris and Bologna and all mediæval universities sprang out of the practical needs of the people. I do not know whether there is anyone here who is disposed to call that utilitarianism, or to go further and brand it as commercialism; but, whether these terms be used or not, the fact is beyond contradiction. Salerno, as I have said, produced a school of medicine. Salerno was a health resort, and invalids came there; the climate was salubrious; there were mineral springs in the neighborhood; and a medical school was a necessary, or at any rate, was a very advantageous addition to the attractions of the place. It grew up naturally in connection with these needs. In the same way, as I have already said, Bologna and the cities of northern Italy had before them that great practical problem—for it was much greater in the middle

ages than now—of maintaining law and order and liberty. They inherited the Roman law as a system by which these results might be achieved. The foundation of the school of Bologna simply met an existing practical need; and if someone thinks that Paris, or Oxford after Paris, founded institutions for the cultivation of knowledge or learning as such, let me point out that Paris and Oxford, too, were in their inception, as they remained for a long period during this early history, mere professional schools. They had their faculty of arts; and, therefore, I ought not to have used the term “mere professional schools”—they had their faculty of arts, that is true; but dialectics and theology ministered as much to the practical and urgent needs of the men of northern Europe as law did to the people of northern Italy; and, furthermore, in northern Europe all the lay professions were open—were practically open—only to churchmen; so that it is quite true of Paris and Oxford as it is of these other institutions, that they met practical intellectual needs. In this connection I think it is worth while observing that the university of our day, which supplies schools of applied science and medicine and law and veterinary science and architecture is playing the same part in the closing years of the nineteenth century as these institutions of Bologna and Paris did in the twelfth and thirteenth centuries. They are ministering to the practical and intellectual needs of our people. I do not use “practical” in any low and narrow sense in either connection; my meaning is simply this—that the people of mediæval ages and the people of these modern times have a certain work to do—certain callings and professions which they will follow; and that a university, now as then, has to set it before itself as aim to teach the sciences and supply the intellectual training which enables the followers of these pursuits to discharge their duties more efficiently. I mean, however, nothing low in the conception of education—far from it; I am simply insisting that the conception of today shall be broadened so that our universities shall be to our generation what those mediæval institutions—“*studia generalia*”—were to theirs.

And the next thing which I want to emphasize is this: that the history of universities from the time of Paris and Bologna down to this very year, proves one thing—that if they are to do their work well, the teachers must be absolutely free (applause). Knowledge is a thing which cannot be commanded. The truth of propositions cannot be established by councils or by tyrants, whether those tyrants be aristocratic individuals or whether they be democratic communities. We have to discover the truth the better to teach the truth; and as we know from our own experience, so the history of these institutions proves, that that work is done efficiently, so that we are true to the ideal of our vocation, only when we can be absolutely free. There has been some talk of late in our own country of the accountability of the universities to the public; and we have been told by reputable organs of opinion, that while liberty must be, of course, conceded to the universities, license will not be tolerated. Ladies and gentlemen, there is no liberty in things intellectual unless it is absolute. Of course, if a professor is immoral—if he violates the laws of decency or propriety—he is dealt with on that ground; but in things intellectual it is absolutely impossible to lay down any limit whatsoever except this; that teachers must teach and discover what God gives them to see of the truth (applause).

I wish I had time to illustrate the baneful consequences of interference with the right of teaching in some of the greatest universities of the world. I have alluded to Oxford once or twice; let me once more cite from its history. The Tudor kings regarded Oxford as an instrument of statecraft, and the position of the university—its officers too—were changed with every change of administration. When the Stuarts came in, Oxford University passed a solemn resolution that it was illegal to resist kings; and that was repeated during the worst period of the Stuart government. The Stuarts interfered with the election by the fellows of the heads of the colleges. They had favorites of their own (altogether unqualified for the places) whom they desired to see put in them.

But the whirligig of time brought its revenge. The follow-

ing century was one of the lowest in the history of Oxford University. It was a period of stagnation; and when Gibbon was there in the middle of the eighteenth century he declared that the university professors had practically given up teaching, that the college tutors and professors passed their day in a monotonous round of employments in chapel and hall; and they retired in the evening to bed exhausted and satisfied with a long round of indolence and indifference. And Jeremy Bentham, who came only a little while afterwards, tells us that whatever else Oxford education might have produced, there were two features on which everyone could count: these were mendacity and insincerity. Once interfere with the liberty of teaching—once put any kind of authority over the man who occupies a university position other than that of his own intellect and conscience, and the results which Jeremy Bentham described at Oxford University, will inevitably follow.

Now there is another matter to which I should like, in the next place, to invite your attention. You have been discussing today the relation between colleges and universities. And my friend, Mr. Dewey, is anxious, I believe, to get up a league of what he calls small colleges; and I suppose the league will change from year to year because these colleges are all progressive; and after a little while they will cease to be small colleges and the league will break up. But it is supposed that you can lay down certain marks which differentiate the college from the university, and that it is exceedingly important at the present time that a clear line of demarcation should be drawn. I shall not undertake to draw that line; but I do want to make a few observations on the historical relationship between the college and university. If the university, as I have said, is comparatively new (the oldest not more than eight hundred years old), the college is younger still. The college is the successor of the hostel, or boarding house. The college, in its earliest form (ladies and gentlemen, I speak respectfully of the colleges) was a mere organization of students under one of their own members whom they elected as head or principal for the purpose of

providing for board and lodgings. The university had no kind of homes for the students who were compelled either to live in private houses, or a group of them might take a house by themselves and organize in the way I described. These were originally called halls; and at Oxford University last summer I found and took much interest in visiting the sole survivor of that venerable system, St. Edmund's Hall. The other halls have all been turned into colleges. I will speak of the transition in a little while, but I am very anxious to impress upon your minds the fact that the college originally was simply a hall of residence, or, better still, a boarding house taken by a group of students who elected one of their own number as head of the hall. He did the catering, and he administered their self-imposed statutes.

We hear it said sometimes that colleges are a peculiarity of the English-speaking world. Never was there a more misleading assertion. The halls out of which the Oxford Colleges have grown were a universal institution. Such halls or colleges existed in Bologna, in Paris, in various German and Spanish universities, and elsewhere. To this day the oldest of the universities, Bologna, has still its College of Spain, which was a boarding house, founded or endowed by a Spanish ecclesiastic soon after the establishment of the university itself. And in Paris, at the close of the fifteenth century, there were at least fifty such halls, and they were almost all called colleges there, although their functions were scarcely at all different from those which I have just described as the halls. There were some fifty of them, I say, in Paris at the close of the fifteenth century. The transition from the hall—from the voluntary organization of students, with one of their own number as agent, caterer, or principal, to what we know as the Oxford College, was effected in this way. By degrees the university authorities found it expedient, for the sake of discipline, to get some control of these halls, and so they managed in time, by a process which I cannot now describe, to get a voice in the appointment of the principal. That was the first step. The next step was this: when money was left for the endowment of such boarding

houses, or halls, it was provided by some benefactors that instruction should be given to the boys in the colleges to supplement, of course, and prepare for the instruction given in the "studia generalia," or the universities themselves. The Paris halls never got beyond that intermediary stage. They, in their highest state of development, remained boarding houses, over which the university exercised a kind of supervision, and in which there were fellows, or masters, or teachers, who aided the boys in preparation of the university work. But the Oxford institutions underwent a third stage of development, and that was due, one might say, to the accident of endowments, and notably to the endowment of Merton. Merton College was founded about 1264, becoming the model of all subsequent foundations, and Walter Merton, who founded it, provided that there should be, in his college, a number of fellows who should be maintained out of the endowments he left for that purpose, and that these fellows should have charge of the property. That is the unique feature about the Oxford institutions at this period. They became corporate land owners. And let me say in passing, one could not have a more splendid justification of the wisdom of these princely benefactors, for of all the endowments that have been left to Oxford and Cambridge Colleges not one has been lost; whereas, in the case of the Parisian halls, where the endowment was left to outside corporations, in nearly every case it has disappeared, and the only remnants we have of these Parisian colleges are the names which they have given to a number of the streets in the Quartier Latin. This was the final stage of development through which the students' boarding house passed. It became a college, in which instruction was given the students, but still merely supplementary to the work of the university. But in those degenerate centuries, which I described a little while ago, when Tudors and Stuarts were interfering in the university, and when its functions fell into disrepute, the good work was done by the colleges; the colleges were progressive; the colleges adapted themselves to the needs of the time; the colleges were champions of the new learning.

The university, in all its functions, fell practically into desuetude; and it is only within our own century that we have seen Oxford University, as distinct from the colleges, taking on new life, appointing university professors, and making provisions for university instruction and for university research. But before that change had taken place there had come migrations to this country, and the American college had been set up; and the American college we set up was intended to conform to the Oxford College of the day, or the Cambridge; and John Harvard came from Emmanuel College at Cambridge. There was then a congeries of college institutions, while the university out of which they grew, and to which they originally were mere boarding houses, was practically defunct.

It is unfortunate for our higher education that our colleges originated in that way and at that time, but such is the fact. You know how in this country the college has, in some cases, been transformed into the university, and what problems we are grappling with today in order to adjust the relations between them. I do not know how the relations are to be adjusted, but I am confident from the point of view of the university (and I say it out of no spirit of hostility to the colleges, for I believe the colleges are going to continue and do a more important work than they have done) that it is a mistake—a fundamental mistake—if you suppose, ladies and gentlemen, that the colleges in this country, or in any other country, are going to take over a large portion of the work which the universities here are doing, and which the universities have always done. Some gentlemen suppose that a university is a collection of professional schools. It never was that; it will not be that here. There will always be in the universities, as there has been in the past of all the great universities, what we call the academic department, and what the Germans call the *philosophische Fakultät*. The colleges are not going to take it from the university. The university, without that, would be robbed of its most important department and would feel the loss of its best and noblest inspiration. That is going to stay; but there is no reason why, if the university

retains these various departments and functions which historically belong to it, the colleges should not also work, if you like, along the same lines—or, if you like, along other lines. There is room for us all. It is a field broad enough for generous rivalry and emulation. We can all put in our oars, and we will all find abundant water to row in. But there is one thing which I think the universities and colleges must keep especially in view, and that is what Mr. Rashdall says characterized the universities of the middle ages from beginning to end—they trained up a race of educated men to administer the affairs of the world. That, and nothing less than that, must be the aim of our own higher institutions of learning. And in pursuing that aim, along however various lines, I see no reason why there should be friction, or jealousy, or envy; why, on the other hand, there should not be the utmost good feeling and hearty and cordial brotherhood between our colleges and universities and the men in them who are dedicated to the high work of educating the rising generation and upholding and extending the divine light of knowledge (applause).

J. G. SCHURMAN

CORNELL UNIVERSITY,
Ithaca, N. Y.